

### GENERIC AZATHIOPRIN FOR KIDNEY TRANSPLANT PATIENTS—ANALYSIS OF COST SAVINGS

Georgieva SS<sup>1</sup>, Stoimenova A<sup>2</sup>, Petrova GI<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Aleksandrovska Hospital, Sofia, Bulgaria; <sup>2</sup>Medical University, Faculty of Pharmacy, Sofia, Bulgaria

**OBJECTIVES:** To analyze the cost savings after an introduction of the generic version of azathioprin for patients with transplanted kidney. **METHODS:** Prospective observational study of the cost of pharmacotherapy of patients was performed during 2009–2010. It was collected information for 121 patients previously treated with the originator and transferred to the generic medicines. The patient sample was systematized according to patient age, gender, additional medicines used for main therapy, and monthly cost of pharmacotherapy. **RESULTS:** The average monthly cost of the combined immunosuppressing therapy when the original product was included was €320.99 and after the introduction of the generic version it became €311.29. On the other hand the monthly cost of the therapy only with azathioprin changed from €6.71 to €5.78 per patient per month. The patients' number varies among 121 to 96 during different months due to the drop out. After the introduction of the generic version 7 patients were switched to another immunosuppressive agent, while for the originator the corresponding figure is 2 patients. For the switched patients the cost of pharmacotherapy did not increase. **CONCLUSIONS:** In spite of the contradictory introduction of generic versions of immunosuppressors, due to their narrow therapeutic index the drop out of the patients is not higher and the savings for the health care system are possible.

PUK10

### A COST EVALUATION OF PERITONEAL DIALYSIS AND HEMODIALYSIS IN THE TREATMENT OF ESRD IN SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL

Ferraz MB<sup>1</sup>, Mendes de Abreu M<sup>2</sup>, Walker DR<sup>3</sup>, de Castro Cintra Sesso R<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universidade Federal de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil; <sup>2</sup>Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, SP, Brazil; <sup>3</sup>Baxter Healthcare Corporation, McGaw Park, IL, USA

**OBJECTIVES:** ESRD patient survival is similar for hemodialysis (HD) and peritoneal dialysis (PD). In Brazil, access to dialysis is universal, although the resources consumed and their costs are poorly understood. We compare the resources used for the treatment of patients undergoing HD or PD who are covered by public insurance. **METHODS:** A one-year prospective study comparing resource use and total costs of prevalent patients treated with HD (n = 210) and PD (n = 194) was conducted in 5 dialysis units in São Paulo, Brazil. Inclusion criteria: ≥18 years of age and clinically stable on chronic dialysis. The study period was April 2007 to February 2009. Data were obtained at baseline, 6 and 12 months using surveys and medical records. Cost categories included hospitalizations, diagnostic and therapeutic procedures, medications, professional fees, transportation, and lost productivity (current homemakers who stopped working due to dialysis). Government reimbursement rate was used as a proxy for the direct costs related to the act of dialysis (maintenance). The study took the societal perspective. **RESULTS:** Approximately 50% of HD and 48% of PD patients were female (p = 0.75); 54% and 58% were white (p = 0.48); mean age was 55.2 and 60.6 (P < 0.001); 62% and 71% had diabetes (p = 0.0528); and 59% and 55% had coronary heart disease (p = 0.37), respectively for HD and PD. Overall average costs per patient-year of follow up was US\$23,283 for HD and US\$23,285 for PD patients. The average annual cost per patient-year, per category, for HD and PD were respectively, US\$11,774 and US\$14,058 for maintenance dialysis costs; US\$9,208 and US\$7,559 for medications; US\$94 and US\$43 for hospitalization, US\$796 and US\$487 for travel costs and US\$323 and \$264 for current homemakers lost income due to dialysis. **CONCLUSIONS:** Mean annual total cost of PD and HD are nearly identical, even though the former were significantly older and more diabetic.

PUK11

### THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF RENAL GRAFT FAILURE: A COST ANALYSIS IN A UK SETTING

Sun Y<sup>1</sup>, Cerri K<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK; <sup>2</sup>Bristol-Myers Squibb, Braine-l'Alleud, Belgium

**OBJECTIVES:** Compared to dialysis, kidney transplantation is a highly cost-effective choice for most patients with ESRD. Post transplantation, a key objective is to maintain a functioning graft. When graft failure occurs, the majority of patients return to dialysis. This study is performed to assess the cost of renal graft failure in a UK setting. **METHODS:** A model was built using data from the UK renal registry (2007–2008) to estimate the number of graft failures occurring in the first year after transplantation. Costs for procurement, transplantation, and for the treatment of graft failure, were derived from the result of a systematic review. This study adopted an investment perspective—all the medical resource used from organ procurement to the treatment of graft failure were taken into consideration. **RESULTS:** In the UK, the cost of renal graft failure was approximately £58,847 when taking account the medical resource used from an investment point of view (including transplantation cost, immunosuppressive medication cost and resource to treat post transplantation adverse events for graft failure patients). The post graft failure cost was £28,179. The most important cost contributors are dialysis cost, transplantation cost and post transplantation immunosuppressive medication cost. **CONCLUSIONS:** Estimating the economic impact of graft loss should take into account the cost of management of patients post graft failure, as well as previous medical investment that is lost with the graft (including

PUK12

costs associated with procurement of the organ and transplantation). Improvements in the management of renal transplant patients are needed to reduce the risk of graft loss and the economic burden of graft failure to the health care system.

### INCIDENCE AND COST OF HOSPITALIZATIONS FOR ACUTE URINARY RETENTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO BENIGN PROSTATE HYPERPLASIA IN FRANCE

Cotté FE<sup>1</sup>, Torreton E<sup>2</sup>, Lafuma A<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>GlaxoSmithKline, Marly le Roi, France; <sup>2</sup>CEMKA-EVAL, Paris, France; <sup>3</sup>CEMKA-EVAL, Boulogne la Reine, France

**OBJECTIVES:** Acute urinary retention (AUR) is one of the most significant complications of long-term benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) and often leads to prostate surgery. AUR also represents an important and feared event that needs to be quantified from an economic perspective as well as from the viewpoint of BPH patients. **METHODS:** French hospital information program (PMSI) databases from 2005 to 2008 were used to assess the number of hospitalizations for AUR and their management among males ≥50 years old presenting with a diagnosis of BPH. Number of patients concerned and rates of re-hospitalizations and deaths due to AUR were estimated using the linking system of the PMSI. Cost estimation was performed for the year 2008 adopting the Sickness Funds perspective. **RESULTS:** During the 4-year period, AUR frequency increased to 38,914 hospitalizations (+20.5%, +8.2%, +1.2% compared with 2005, 2006 and 2007, respectively). In 2008, mean length of stay was 5.5 ± 6.9 days and decreased of 6.6% within the study period. Proportion of stays referred by emergency department was 28.8% (14.1%, 20.6%, 25.3% in 2005, 2006 and 2007, respectively). 26,581 males were concerned by at least one AUR (+15.4%, +5.9%, +0.0% compared with 2005, 2006 and 2007, respectively) of whom 32.6% were concerned by a recurrence (28.9%, 30.7%, 31.4% in 2005, 2006 and 2007, respectively). Mean age was 74.1 years (SD:10.4) (stable over the period) and 232 patients (0.9%) deceased during their hospitalization in 2008. Mean cost per patient in 2008 was €2400 (€2663 vs. €1997 in public and private hospitals, respectively). Global cost of hospitalizations for RAU was estimated at €93.4 million (67.2% in public hospitals). **CONCLUSIONS:** AUR attributable to complicated BPH globally increased but tend to become stable in 2008. However, proportion of emergency utilization and recurrent stays amplified. Despite appropriate available therapies, prevention of BPH complications remains suboptimal.

PUK13

### HEALTH CARE COST OF RENAL REPLACEMENT THERAPY IN HUNGARY

Kalo Z<sup>1</sup>, Kiss Z<sup>2</sup>, Gerendy P<sup>2</sup>, Nagyjanosi L<sup>3</sup>, Vokó Z<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary; <sup>2</sup>National Health Insurance Fund Administration, Budapest, Hungary; <sup>3</sup>Syreon Research Institute, Budapest, Hungary

**OBJECTIVES:** Annual cost of renal replacement therapy is an important benchmark for public reimbursement of all health care services. The last report was presented more than 10 years ago in Hungary, so our objective was to calculate the current annual cost of waiting listed dialysis and renal transplantation. **METHODS:** We selected all waiting listed or renal transplanted patients between July 2004 and March 2008. Resource utilization of all health care services with public reimbursement per patient in Q1 2008 were aggregated by linking claims records with anonymised patient IDs. We calculated health care costs of waiting listed and renal transplanted patients. Results were adjusted to gender, age and onset of ESRD by multivariate regression analysis. a total of 135 HUF/USD GDP specific PPP exchange rate was employed to convert results into USD. 2008 cost calculations were compared to results of the 1997 analysis. **RESULTS:** A total of 2209 patients were selected to the analysis. 3 year cost of waiting listed dialysis and renal transplantation was US\$110,742 and US\$87,420 respectively. Renal transplantation is cost-saving within 2 years compared to dialysis. **CONCLUSIONS:** Between 1997 and 2008 the 3-year cost of waiting listed dialysis increased by 60.3%, 3-year cost of renal transplantation increased by 96.8% without correction for inflation. In real values the health care costs waiting listed dialysis and renal transplantation is reduced by 26.7% and 10.0%. During this period the cost-containment measures of the National Health Insurance Fund were successful.

PUK14

### RESOURCE USE AND COSTS OF PATIENTS UNDERGOING DIALYSIS IN BELGIUM

Caekelbergh K<sup>1</sup>, Lamotte M<sup>1</sup>, Dratwa M<sup>2</sup>, Bogaert AM<sup>3</sup>, Bouman K<sup>1</sup>, Laplante S<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>IMS Health Consulting, Brussels, Belgium; <sup>2</sup>CHU Brugmann, Brussels, Belgium; <sup>3</sup>AZ St Elisabeth, Zottegem, Belgium; <sup>4</sup>ZNA Middelheim, Antwerpen, Belgium; <sup>5</sup>Baxter Healthcare Corporation, Braine l'Alleud, Belgium

**OBJECTIVES:** This study was conducted to identify and compare resources and costs used by dialysis patients in Belgium. **METHODS:** The records of 130 patients undergoing dialysis were retrospectively reviewed to identify direct medical and non-medical resources used over year 2006. Data collected: baseline medical characteristics, dialysis-related information and resources used (hospitalizations, ambulatory care, medication, transport). Official tariffs were used for costing. **RESULTS:** Patients were hospitalized 1.5 ± 1.7 times for 18.1 ± 29.1 days. Laboratory tests were performed more frequently in hemodialysis (HD) patients than in peritoneal dialysis (PD) patients (295.6 ± 137.7 vs. 120.1 ± 75.5; P < 0.0001). Patients on HD took more medications (12.4 ± 3.7 vs. 10.7 ± 4.3; P = 0.0254). 79% of patients received EPO (average dose: 10,587 ± 14,114 IU). Patients on PD had more ambulatory consultations (9.7 ± 8.8

PUK15